DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 269 EA 029 774

AUTHOR Bhattacharyya, Maitrayee
TITLE Creating a New Research Agenda on Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and Underachievement. A Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement (Washington, DC, March 6, 1998).
INSTITUTION National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board (ED/OERI), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1998-03-06
NOTE 58p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Academic Failure; Elementary Secondary Education; *Racial Factors; *Research Needs; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; *Social Attitudes; Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a workshop on race, gender, class, and student achievement. The workshop was called to help set the nation's educational-research agenda with regard to social-status distinctions. Invited panelists made recommendations about how race, gender, and class should be conceptualized and measured in educational research and how educational research can incorporate analyses that examine the isolated and interactive effects of race, gender, and class. The report summarizes panelists' recommendations and includes four broad topical sections: "The Concepts of Race, Gender, and Class in a New Educational Research Agenda"; "The Analyses of Isolated and Interactional Effects of Race, Gender, and Class;" "The Theoretical and Methodological Criteria for Future Educational Research"; and "The Applied Substance of a New Educational Research Agenda." Each section begins with a brief summary of the recommendations made, followed by a list of the recommendations enacted, and ends with excerpts from the discussion so as to put the recommendations in context. Recommendations include treating race as a process, not as a category, exploring how racial categories within schools take on meanings over time, and preparing longitudinal studies of values that are usually conflated with class. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TM

ED 430 269

Creating A New Research Agenda on Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and Underachievement

A Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement

Sponsored by the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC

March 6, 1998

EA 029 774

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Creating a New Research Agenda on Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and Underachievement

A Workshop
Sponsored by the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board
U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC
March 6, 1998

List of Participants:

Workshop Facilitator
John Stanfield, II

Workshop Panelists
Frank Bonilla
Eugene Cota-Robles
Vivian Gadsden
Antoine Garibaldi
Edmund T. Gordon
Robert Hill
Evelyn Hu DeHart
Scott Miller
Jessica Nembhard
Charlene Rivera
William Trent

National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board
Members Participating:
Kenji Hakuta, Chair
James E. Bottoms
Ann Clark
Edmund W. Gordon
Robert Marley
Joyce Muhlestein
Alba Ortiz
Claire Pelton

Eve M. Bither, Executive Director

Workshop Writer
Maitrayee Bhattacharyya

Table of Contents

Executive Summary/ i

I. Preliminaries / 1

II. Sessions 1-3:
The Concepts of Race, Gender, and Class in a New Educational Research Agenda / 3
The Concept of Race / 3
The Concept of Class / 7
The Concept of Gender / 15

III. Sessions 4-5:
The Analyses of Isolated and Interactional Effects of Race, Gender, and Class / 20

IV. The Theoretical and Methodological Criteria for Future Educational Research/ 26

V. The Applied Substance of a New Educational Research Agenda / 33

VI. Suggested Reading/ 37

Appendix A: About the Workshop / 40

Appendix B: The Workshop Agenda / 43

Appendix C: About the Workshop Panelists / 45

Executive Summary
Recommendations for a New Educational Research Agenda

Before schools can do their work successfully, the issues of race, class and gender related to educational achievement must be addressed. However, an obstacle to this is the constraint imposed by the political economy of school reform. In other words, some of the interactions among race, class, gender, and school achievement may have little to do with schooling and more to do with politics and other under-researched, environmental factors such as economies, labor markets, government policies, consumer markets, media, and technological advancements. School reform will not solve all of the problems of low educational achievement as long as there are political and other external environmental reasons that prevent addressing many of the issues. Nevertheless, many areas of research need attention in conceptual, applied, and methodological terms. A summary of these recommendations appears below.

The Concepts of Race, Class, and Gender in a New Educational Research Agenda

With race, new or emerging lines of inquiry should address:

- Race as a process, not as a category alone, and also research the processes of racism and racialization
- Racialized interactions between people and institutions and institutions as human entities with racialized histories, traditions, practices, values, norms, and stratified hierarchies
- How racial categories within schools take on meanings over time and how those meanings change. How racial categories are used on those who reside in certain categories
- Detailed ethnographic analysis of how educational experiences are felt in different racialized schooling settings, attending to the importance of context, and the importance of serious training of ethnographers or researchers to do such research
- Building nuances of categories and subcultures
- Research which reconstructs institutional levels and kinds of institutions as formal and informal matrixes and networks which influence achievement in schooling processes
- Identification of the human resources of different groups and how well these are used
- The structures that arise as the social context alters relationships among groups, and particularly how the response of the oppressed takes different forms. How, once a few

gains are made by oppressed groups, there is an immediate reaction to restructure to keep oppression ongoing

- Research on subpopulations and on population growth in urban areas through new streams of immigration and other major demographic shifts; and how such shifts are affecting schools and the ability of culturally and linguistically different students to achieve.

With class, new or emerging lines of inquiry should address:

- Examining class not only as an analytical category, but also as a process
- Distinguishing between class and cultural orientation
- Examining human capital in a way that incorporates social and cultural capital and not merely income or material capital
- Analyzing or monitoring the redistribution of people from certain types of locations within cities across urban spaces and whether that is beneficial to children
- Examining different access to resources and its effects across levels of income (so-called classes)
- Identifying destructive behaviors and mediating factors.

With gender, new or emerging lines of inquiry should provide:

- Greater understanding of differences in the treatment of boys and girls at different points in schooling and how this treatment is affected by gender, race, and class of the teacher and of the student; how students are treated in other social circles such as peers and significant others in other community institutions such as churches, athletics, employers, law enforcement, and media
- More rigorous investigation of the treatment and expectations of achievement by boys, particularly low-income African American and Latino boys.
- Exploration on the treatment and achievement expectations of girls, particularly low-income African–American and Latino girls, and their relationship to white students
- Increased research on the context of gender, in itself and then paired with race and with class; increased research which explores the interactional effects of all three factors—gender, race, and class

- Work on assessment, placement, and labeling of students, e.g., in learning disability classrooms

- Expansive definitions and more critical studies of gender as an insulated variable and a class– and race– related variable

- Developmental studies that focus on children throughout schooling

- Intergenerational and life-course development studies that illuminate the short– and long–term effects of gender and treatment in regard to student achievement and underachievement

- Studies that examine students' perceptions of female and male teachers and teacher perceptions and expectations of female and male students by age, race, and class

- Changes over time in access, success, and achievement

- More studies of how males and females experience primary school.

The Analyses of Isolated and Interactional Effects of Race, Class, and Gender

Regarding the isolated and interactional factors of class, race, and gender, research should:

- Prepare longitudinal studies of values that are usually conflated with class

- Investigate under-performance and the "doubt structure" from an intergenerational perspective

- Investigate the long-term, cumulative effects of racism and the concentration of poverty in various manifestations; for example, the long-term effects of not having any schools in certain communities

- Redefine socioeconomic status (SES) and think of SES in terms of two generations, and study the models of reform that are already in place in different context and communities

- Explore or broaden Kessler's type of work

- Investigate how the multiple communities that people reside in influence how young people learn; the functions of schools and how schools are integrated into community systems

- Investigate the problems NAEP data reveal as networks that have effects on achievement

- Investigate the role of one's relationship to different communities to achievement among children
- Identify those problems that have not been addressed for political reasons
- Define the community in new ways, because community is not necessarily the same for all people
- Widen the school reform efforts to reach subpopulations, and collect data on school improvement strategies for certain subpopulations
- Examine the role of language as well as class, race, and gender
- Undertake large-scale surveys that incorporate an understanding of language.
- Redefine what "language minority" stands for, and make sure appropriate subpopulation sampling is done
- Find ways to build supplementary or "shadow education"
- Facilitate development of peer networks, academically oriented learning communities, and supplementary strategies for higher performance in academic achievement
- Identify communities at risk of becoming destabilized and identify what is needed to stabilize them
- Research how different policy measures interact and might impact academic achievement
- Consider the causal model that prompts people to draw a relationship between a particular reform or intervention and its likely outcome.

The Theoretical and Methodological Criteria for a New Educational Research Agenda

Methodological concerns in the new research should include:

- Recognition of the rapid pluralization of society and increase categories to keep up with the number of groups that are emerging
- Development of inter-disciplinary efforts that incorporate community participation and make local and trans-national connections (there is a need to find places for such research in universities)

- Focus on the intersection of macro– and micro– levels of analysis within the context of schooling, by looking at the interactions of institutional, structural, interpersonal and daily experience levels

- The identification of types and cycles of oppression and discrimination, and ways in which oppression of communities occur

- Multi-layered approaches to examining how individuals are couched in institutions and networks, ranging from school classrooms to the school, to the district, to the community itself, to the metropolitan area, to the political economy

- More extensive use of ethnographic approaches and attention to the quality of ethnographic training.

The Applied Substance of a New Educational Research Agenda

The applied substance of new research should attend to:

- Teacher perceptions and teacher preparation
- Students' perceptions and ideas about learning
- Allocation of resources and the process of allocation
- Who does the research and who gets funding
- Investigation of families in terms of decision–making processes and impacting structures
- School and community structures, norms, values
- Programs to help people who have little formal education and who are poor get access to more middle-class resources of the kinds that are associated with more academic success
- Parent programs to help uneducated people make educated decisions about schooling and ways of fostering academic achievement
- Information about ways in which people experience schools, schooling, and related processes that goes beyond inferences from performance on standardized tests.

Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement: Creating a New Research Agenda on Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and Underachievement

I. Preliminaries: The Workshop

On March 6, 1998, a group of prominent researchers convened for the *Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement: Creating a New Research Agenda on Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and on Educational Underachievement.*[1] The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board (NERPPB) of the U. S. Department of Education sponsored the workshop, which took place in Washington, DC.

Panelists[2] in attendance included John H. Stanfield, II, workshop facilitator, and Frank Bonilla, Eugene Cota-Robles, Vivian Gadsden, Antoine Garibaldi, Edmund T. Gordon, Robert Hill, Evelyn Hu DeHart, Scott Miller, Jessica Nembhard, Charlene Rivera, and William Trent. NERPPB members in attendance included James E. Bottoms, Ann Clark, Edmund W. Gordon, Kenji Hakuta, Robert Marley, Joyce Muhlestein, Alba Ortiz, and Claire Pelton. Executive director, Eve M. Bither, attended, as did representatives of the educational research community.

Kenji Hakuta, NERPPB Chair, and Edmund W. Gordon, Board member, set the context for the workshop.[3] The panelists had been invited to the workshop to help set the nation's educational research agenda with regard to social status distinctions. Kenji Hakuta informed panelists that NERPPB engages in two major activities on an ongoing basis. The first is to develop, articulate, and to advocate for priorities in educational research. The second is to address the research, development, and dissemination capacities to forward the research agenda. Edmund W. Gordon informed panelists NERPPB considers an urgent educational problem that the society faces to be the challenge of breaking the uneven relationships between class status and achievement, racial status and achievement, gender status and achievement, and the interaction of these three status factors and student achievement. He added that the Board seeks the improvement of academic achievement for all students; and therefore, the Board has given priority to uncoupling the relationship between categories of social distinction such as gender, race, ethnicity, class, and school achievement and understanding interactions between these ways of categorizing people as they impact on school achievement.

---

1 See also "A Word From the Board" and "A Word From the Facilitator" in the Appendices.

2 More information on participants and proceedings are included in the Appendices to this report.

3 The Workshop agenda is included in the Appendices to this report.

Workshop facilitator Professor John Stanfield of the University of California at Davis reviewed the purpose of the workshop and the agenda. He reminded workshop panelists that they were to undertake a detailed discussion about the concepts of race, gender, and class. They should discuss the utilization of these social status concepts as isolated and interactional variables in educational research and discuss past findings regarding the impact of social status on educational achievement and educational under-achievement. Dr. Stanfield indicated the workshop would proceed in two major sessions, beginning in the morning with discussions of race, gender and class as concepts, and ending in the afternoon with discussions of race, gender, and class as isolated and interactional variables in educational research. Each discussion would begin with a brief introduction by persons serving as leaders. Each session would close with a review of the recommendations that were made.

As the workshop proceeded, panelists made recommendations about how race, gender and class should be conceptualized and measured in educational research and how educational research can incorporate analyses that examine the isolated and interactive effects of race, gender and class. Panelists made recommendations for which education research questions should receive priority, what the overall research agenda should look like, and what theoretical and methodological criteria should guide educational research, particularly research having to do with student achievement.

This report summarizes the recommendations made by the panelists during the *Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement: Creating a New Research Agenda on Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and on Educational Underachievement*. The report includes four broad topical sections (see Contents Sections II-V); each begins with a brief summary of the recommendations made, followed by a list of the recommendations made, and ends with excerpts from the discussion which put the recommendations in context, provide the panelists' rationale, and include sensitizing concepts. To preserve the voice and authenticity of the panelists' dialogue, only minor editorial changes have been made to excerpts, and individual speakers' comments are not identified. This report was prepared using the writer's own notes from the workshop and a transcript of the meeting.

II. Sessions 1-3: The Concepts of Race, Gender, and Class in a New Educational Research Agenda

The Concept of Race[4]: Discussion Summary.
Overall, panelists want to see race treated as an equal, not an inferior, topic in research and desire the development of an applied educational policy research effort in which group identity and group position are centrally located. They also think research needs to demystify structure and move away from the reification of race. Instead, more research should deal with the nuances of race, racisms, and racialized interactions. Panelists also stress the importance of studying racial structures of opportunity, particularly processes of allocation and segregation, in addition to how people are socialized to opportunity and what cultural, economic, and political resources different groups have that affect educational achievement.

They also assert that differences in how children are treated and what they are taught may override how groups get along. In this regard, they see a need for further information on group identity and attitude structure to increase the depth of understanding of how different subpopulations see the world tied to operational matters and of how to change what people think regarding allocations, i.e., to identify what it takes to persuade professionals and others that money should be invested in education. Finally, they suggest that sensitizing teachers to race in a piecemeal fashion is insufficient and want to see less "teaching about race" and more "critical race, gender, and class theory" in teacher training.

The Concept of Race: Recommendations for Future Research.
Panelists recommendations regarding the concept of race in future research are as follows:

- study race, racisms, and racialization as processes not only as categories but also as complex, synchronic, relational, political, economic, and social processes;
- study racialized interactions between people and multiple levels of institutions;
- study the human resources of different racial groups;
- study the meanings of racial categories, perceptions, and assumptions, and consequences of their use over time or resulting actions toward people who 'reside' in a particular category;
- study how education, racisms, and the subtleties of racism are experienced in different racialized settings; how this translates into marginalization for different groups and combinations of advantage and disadvantage simultaneously for some groups such as those viewed as "Honorary Whites" (Jewish and Asian groups); and how communities come to understand how they are situated in racial structures of opportunity;

---

[4] This session was introduced by Dr. Frank Bonilla.

- study processes of allocation and segregation not just socialization and how that shapes the opportunity to learn and how allocators make decisions; such measures would help shift research from examining deficit hypotheses to examining geographical context hypotheses and from a crude idea of structural impact to a more nuanced exploration of systematic intrusions and absence of structures;
- respect and dignify race, culture and ethnicity as equally important categories for educational research. Ensure that race, culture and ethnicity are studied and/or referred to in educational research in all their diversity, and on an equal footing (rather than as pathologies or aberrations, or even legally required categories that are tolerated but not well understood or respected);
- study how to develop categories that capture variations or multiples of race.

The Concept of Race: Discussion Excerpts—Context and Concepts.
Below appear excerpts from the workshop discussion relevant to the above recommendations.

> Researchers usually talk about race as a category, and workshop panelists are suggesting race be thought about as a process, instead of a category. If you look, for example, at the history of the United States, this has always been a very diverse population. However, people who would even now seem to be very diverse racially, have been categorized, through particular kinds of racialized processes. So that even the white population has in the past been divided up racially, between Jews and Irish, et cetera, and so the process by which these people have become *white*, and the process by which a very racially diverse population has become *black*, is very important.

> One of the key aspects of how these processes operate is racism itself. Any kind of conversation about race and racial categories can't be undertaken without talking about racism as a process and racism as a social reality. This must include discussion of the ways in which the racialization of people places people in categories, racialized groups, and how those categories change over time based on the kind of racialized interaction between them. The concern is with ways that different groups have been racialized and subordinated or privileged through racialized processes. The concern is also with racism, and racism in the plural, racisms, because much of the subtlety that has been talked about has to do with the kinds of critical thinking that have not been developed to recognize how racism has changed over time. In other words, the kinds of positions or the kinds of racisms that are launched against African Americans are not the same today as they were 20 or 30 years ago. It takes time to be able to identify those new processes. Researchers need to talk about what these nuance issues in racisms are and the ways in which they translate into an issue of marginality.

> Most minority students are in segregated schools, as segregated today as they were 30 years ago. Many of these students do not have the kinds of resources that they

need to be able to match the education that is going on in other places. The small numbers of minority students in gifted and talented programs in this country may be explained as a fact of racism and as a lack of consciousness or expectations that individuals do not see African–American students or Native American students and Asian–American students in the same light as perhaps white students. All across the country in our major school districts, the majority of the students in public schools are minority students, but they have larger numbers of whites in many of the gifted and talented programs. On the opposite side, over a third, and sometimes as much as a half , of the students in programs for special learners, or students who are multiply suspended and expelled from school are minority students. These are not accidents, and all the students who are in these categories do not have less intelligence than the other students.

While racial categories do not necessarily have significance over time, unfortunately they do often come to have significance, though different significance for different people, because of the racism in the society. It can affect young immigrant children very shortly after they get here. It can have a debilitating effect, particularly for some children of color. But it raises another question of both the directness and also the subtleties of racism, which have not been identified in many discourses.

There is the multiracial and subcultural reality of Latinos and Afro–Americans, which is, in addition, now exploding in both instances. Sub-ethnic groups exist within the black population. Blacks are Hispanic. Blacks are also African, Caribbean, West Indian. Researchers know the Haitian population is growing, as are other French speaking black populations. These nuances must exist when researchers are talking about educational achievement. These are some of the variations that researchers should have to deal with in future research. Though variation has always been there for Afro-Americans, it has been masked by this "one drop renders you black" mandate, so that multiracial and multiethnic heritage has gone historically unacknowledged or suppressed. For example, in the Deep South in the 1930s, one learned the basics of real segregation. The mosaic and physical appearances in segregated settings at some schools, which were technically for black children, were just the same as what one experienced as a Spanish–speaking person in New York in East Harlem. There was a total racial division into either black or white, though there were kids that were red–haired, or white–looking; but in Memphis they were black. That was just the beginning, and one learned about what being multiracial outside the barrio setting meant. The basic premise that gets imprinted from childhood is that any tinge of blackness is a misfortune.

Surging multi-racialization has made the standard race categories progressively more unrealistic in official census and public data keeping in many parts of the country. The U.S. path so far has been to combine race with ethnic origin as a way out of the dilemma. This at least signals an acceptance of the social constitution of groupness, despite all the bell curve incursions, and continued tracking of genetic

links to capacities and behaviors by geneticists and psychometricians. There is a massive array of growing inequalities that has rendered many guesses about which genes or environmental conditions may be at work essentially moot in most large data bases. It is almost impossible to disentangle what is actually operating as a decisive influence on outcomes and behaviors.

Young people in what is the post–Civil Rights era, post 1965, experience race now differently from those who learned about it and lived it before 1965, certainly the last 10 years. Part of this confusion is how people look at themselves personally, on an every day, individual way. That is very different from the need for bureaucratic or policy reasons to continue to count race in a certain way, because that's the only way researchers know how. Researchers have to deal with these two aspects of race. Society needs to maintain some way of counting and categorizing, because society has built public policies around them, in recognition of the history of racism and its legacies in this country. Society does not know any other way of getting around that. On the other hand, those categories are not as meaningful anymore to a lot of Americans, particularly young Americans, and especially immigrants. Researchers are caught in the dilemma of racial categories that are not always very meaningful to the people who have been assigned these categories. At the same time that research cannot do away with categories, scholars must recognize their limitations— the fact that they do not play to people's personal daily experience in a very significant and meaningful way.

It is good to have a conceptual clarity about the different reasons for needing to understand racial and ethnic categorization. On the one hand, there is the counting reason, which has a lot to do with public policy notions about allocation. There is also the distinction between self-definition and reference in issues of identity. But the most critical one encountered in education research is how those who hold these disparate and varied notions regarding these particular categories use it on people who reside there. That becomes a critical issue. People use ill–formed understandings in a way which persistently harms persons who reside in particular categories. People are very sophisticated about it on the one hand, because of the pervasiveness of it, but at the same time are not necessarily fully conscious of it. For a child, whether it makes a difference to him or her, the difference is made because he or she resides here, and that becomes something that he or she has to respond to on a continuing basis. It is the fact that one resides in the category black that is consequential from the interpersonal to the institutional level.

There is an important dimension for identity and categorization that ought to be brought to bear in the education policy and research agenda. America is having trouble reaching consensus around resource allocation. The more pluralistic a society is and the more new pluralistic forces that are introduced on an ongoing basis, make it harder than ever to reach consensus. The social psychologists who do the survey research on what people think are not widely drawn upon by

educational policymakers. That means that a lot of what they know already is not informing how to get the policy process to function more effectively for resource allocation purposes. But it also means the kinds of questions they ask, at the depth they ask them, probably are not nearly what they need to be. There needs to be a substantial applied research agenda, in order to understand how different subpopulations are seeing the world—how they are seeing the world is changing. This should be tied to very operational matters of what kinds of information, if any, will lead them to change their ideas of how much more resources should be invested in high poverty zone schools. This should not replace research into the issues of how kids are treated and what they are taught, since that may override, to some degree, some of the larger issues about how different groups get along. However, this can yield useful information about the related concern with the obstacles to effective trans-racial ethnic coalition–building. Much remains to be done to advance this long frustrated coming together of intellectual and policy endeavors.

The United States is pluralizing more rapidly than researchers can identify categories of population, and what their prospects are. The categories Asian–American or Latino–American, African–American, or White American are soft. Nonetheless, in order to understand the enormous variation of circumstances, categories on some level are going to be needed for a while. With the increasing diversity of the U.S. population, researchers know that they are going to be dealing with these multiple categories. Researchers know the categories that the Census uses, which everyone concedes are called "race," but are not race; rather, "race" is a social definition. Race is relational. Race does not appear and just stand by itself. Race connotes how people are treated and how society treats people more than with whom they may identify. These are some nuances that are going to have to be dealt with. With the increasing diversity of the population, some categories must be developed to try to reflect the cultural diversity of the population.

For the time being, research must maintain four racial categories: *white*, *black*, *Asian* and *Native American* and have a fall back *other*, which is *Hispanic*— but *Hispanic whites*, *Hispanic blacks*. Researchers need to identify and improve categories by using a combination of categories; it is pertinent to make categories of race, as race is understood by the people studied. One might start by merging race with national origin or national connection not only for Hispanics, but for every racial community, because all of them are internally diverse by culture, national origin, and so on. But, that has tremendous implications, depending on the size of the data set. There should be two sets of tabulations, and people should be able to have multiples, but not for political reapportionment purposes. The other data set should be revert back to traditional categories, because persons are not discriminated against because they are "multiple"; they are discriminated because they are a particular group, and researchers would like to be able to retain that.

The Concept of Class[5]: Discussion Summary.
Overall, panelists think the conceptualization of class in research, like race, requires revision, and greater acknowledgment that class is also a form of identification is needed. Panelists suggest that since most Americans want to believe they are part of the middle class, perhaps Americans may be embarrassed about class and the connotations of being upper or lower class. Panelists recommend that more teaching about how to talk about class is needed.

Panelists also assert research does not measure class; studies measure income and translate that into socio-economic status and class. Researchers who rely on income to measure class should, at the very least, be sensitized to the concept of wealth. Researchers should also be aware of the problems of equating class with culture. Conflation of social and cultural capital with income, education, and occupation is a socially constructed problem that has become embedded in research. Research generally takes class as an objective analytic category indicated by "objective" facts of income, education, and occupation; however, class lumps people with disparate life experiences together into the same category based on similar incomes. Grouping the urban poor with the rural poor, for example, or all professionals with the dominant class and imputing the same power, control, and culture to them can mask meaningful differences. In addition, efforts to cut data to make data show two cultures or bimodality of cultures also require scrutiny. Such practices result in the omission of categorizations such as the black working class because such categories do not fit the typology desired or confuse the model the data must fit. This allows gaps in research to endure and stereotypes to dominate research.

Furthermore, like race, class must be conceptualized as a process, not merely an analytic category. This means that research must recognize the processes of class formation and the relationship of class to power and control relationships as well as to involuntary and voluntary group associations. Imputing that people who are middle class have normal values and people of lower class must therefore have less civilized culture and operate at a lower social level or have a culture of poverty obfuscates the role of material deprivation in development of community institutions. Furthermore, what determines the basic classes is subjective and changes over time as do the values and prestige of social classes. Thus, researchers must say how to define whatever terms they use to describe classes rather than treating them as given. In addition, the common practice of saying that "poverty is controlled for" can not be accepted as a substitute for controlling for other contextual factors. Researchers should also use caution in correlating isolated behaviors to underachievement without regard for class factors. For example, saying parental absence causes underachievement may be over simplistic. Many teenagers in upper middle–class suburbs live with the absence of parents, but many of these families may have access to resources that mediate for absent parents.

---

[5] This session was introduced by Dr. Edmund T. Gordon.

The Concept of Class: Recommendations for Future Research.
Panelists recommendations regarding the concept of class in future research are as follows:

- Study class and class formation, perception of life chances, and construction of belief systems as dynamic processes rather than as static and permanent;

- Study class as social constructions and how people think about themselves in relation to power and inequality; study to what extent class identity relates to ascriptive versus meritocratic processes and how people see their class as related to being a failure or a success;

- Study class in relationship to material, cultural, linguistic, and social goods and capital other than merely income; who has social and cultural capital is not always who has income; use multiple indicators of class and not solely "objective" indicators; dissociate class from culture;

- Deepen the analysis of class in educational research to incorporate wealth indicators, not just income and education; differentiate class categories along racial dimensions; expose the relationships among class, economic values, and the system of valuation (i.e., why are there class divisions, how does society value work and which kinds of jobs are valued with greater returns); distinguish between class, socioeconomic status, levels of material deprivation, and cultural orientations that define schools as important investments; design different treatment strategies depending on such distinctions;

- Study to what extent and how class consciousness about the non-efficacy of schools exists and to what extent other factors are at play; for example, study why from the 8th to 12th grade both African–American males and English working class youth appear to learn that schooling is not a worthwhile investment;

- Study to what extent academic achievement results from a combination of capital sources; expand the notion of human capital, and to what extent underachievement is related to a downdraft effect caused by being below an economic threshold; study success, not only failure, and recognize differences among the poor;

- Study what it is about poverty that is destructive and whether it is uniformly destructive; study conditions like consistency, stability, and reliability irrespective of levels of material comfort; identify destructive behaviors and examine them in all income levels and explain rates and correlations with achievement; also explore political and economic contexts; study the effect of poverty on children in the schools, particularly in the earlier years;

- Study to what extent conditions make people "think poor";

- Study efforts to redistribute persons moved out of projects like the Robert Taylor Homes, and whether redistributing persons across urban space benefits children;

- Study the impact of deprivation at different stages of life and different ages;

- Assess what school improvement can do, and for whom, and how this is playing out in larger demographic environments

- Examine why some poor people are socially mobile and others are not; explore such diversity;

- Study social networks, networks of political economy, and social solidarity;

- Look at sources of poverty, and specify what people are poor in; look at poverty within different time periods and different environments.

The Concept of Class: Excerpts from Discussion on Context and Concepts.
Below appear excerpts from the workshop discussion relevant to the above recommendations.

Both the Marxist[6] and the Weberian[7] models of class are problematic. The Marxist one is problematic because of the transformations in capitalist economies that have emerged over the last 30 or 40 years. The U.S. has gone, at least in the North, from an industrial economy to post-industrial, more concerned with service industries and the circulation of information rather than production of goods. There has emerged in the last 30 or 40 years a permanent sector of surplus labor which is invisible; it does not show up in unemployment figures or anywhere else. Those who are totally outside of employment and participating in an informal economy do not get documented unless an urban ethnographer is researching this. There is also a large professional and managerial sector in the economy, which has an ambivalent position in relation to production.

There are also problems with the Weberian notion of class. The Weberian notion of class masks the power relationships which force specific positions in a

---

6 see Marx , Karl. *The German Ideology*.
also Marx, Karl. 1844/1960. Estranged labour -- Economic and Philosophic manuscripts of 1844. In C.W. Mills, ed., *Images of Man*. New York: Modern Library.

7 Weber, M., "Ethnic Groups," Economy and Society. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 1978. Pp. 385-93
Weber, Max. 1930. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. N.Y.: Scribners.

contradictory relationship between labor and capital. In other words, for Weber and those who are looking at Weberian notions of class, class is mostly voluntary. In other words, people associate with others who are of like class and associate in these kinds of institutions. There are rational choices that are made as individuals, which mask the ways in which power operates in the process of class formation. The notions of Weberian class also force together disparate groups of people into particular classes, such as urban and rural poor, but the actual life experiences of the urban poor and the life experiences of the rural poor, just to choose an example, are different. It also forces together, for example, professionals and what would be called the dominant class in ways which are unacceptable as well.

The state or the government in this country, essentially uses a Weberian notion of class, inasmuch as it assigns people to class based on income. In terms of class and the notions of class, this makes a relatively small lower class, an enormous middle class, and a small and invisible so-called upper class, in the government's characterization. The notions of Weberian class used in this country mask stark disparities of wealth and power. So, for example, the Census Bureau has researchers looking at a small group of poor folks, an enormous group of middle class folks, and an invisible group of upper class folks. Comparing that with the statistics on relative wealth in this country shows what is meant when some researchers say notions of class as income mask the stark disparities that do exist. In this country, in terms of wealth and not income, the top one percent of the families in the population control perhaps 40 percent of the nation's wealth. The top 20 percent of the families control perhaps 80 percent of the nation's wealth. The bottom 80 percent, who by this reckoning would be poor, control perhaps only 20 percent of the wealth, and the bottom 20 percent control perhaps only six percent of the wealth of the nation. These kinds of real disparities are masked by Weberian class reckonings.

From a Marxist perspective, class imposes upon society particular structures which are created in the interest of the ruling class. From a Weberian position, class or low class position creates social debility. This notion of class has permeated sociological research. "Class disadvantage" for Blacks meant that Blacks were unable to fully develop middle class social institutions, the key of which is the family. That meant that Blacks were operating at a social level lower than that of Whites and had a pathological culture that was one of the key sources of black debility. For E. Franklin Frazier[8], the solution was to eliminate racism and to integrate black folks into the white community in terms of material terms. Blacks would then be able to develop more healthy middle class institutions. That led directly into Moynihan[9] and Oscar Lewis's[10] notion of the culture of poverty and

---

[8] Frazier, E. Franklin. 1939. *The Negro Family in the United States.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[9] Moynihan, D.P. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research , U.S. Department of Labor.

how class disability affects culture and socialization. That line of reasoning led to William J. Wilson's[11] notion of how economic transformation has caused, at least initially, the debilitating situation of black inner city families. However, he uses that same notion of culture of poverty to think about how the debilitating economic situation undermines black culture and then creates a culture of poverty. This leaves researchers in a situation of thinking about class in ways which are not productive.

As part of the new research agenda, researchers should consider the possibility of moving thinking about class away from class in itself as an analytical category, to thinking about class as a social process, and a process of identification—in other words, in terms of class formation. That might mean analytically thinking about class as ways in which groups form around issues of material inequality and forms of culture. In other words, how is it that people think about themselves and then in terms of their relationship to material equality and inequality and then how they then mediate that relationship to their inequality? It also means thinking about class as the ways in which people who have differing relationships to material goods begin to think about themselves in that way, and form alliances or relations of opposition to other groups of people who have other kinds of positions in relationship to goods. That brings in how people who are seen as being lower class are objectified by dominant groups and then are marginalized based on the notion that they are a group of lower class folks. That has everything to do with the kind of services these people receive. Finally, this will give a way to think about class not so much in such material terms, and in relationship to capital or material goods, but also class in relation to capitalist social and cultural goods. Class debility may have as much or more to do with kinds of accesses to social and cultural capital as it does to accesses to material capital. The kinds of social connections and networks that one has and the kinds of social solidarity that one can create in one's community have to do with accumulation of social capital. Thus, researchers must talk about school achievement in the context of communities and networks of political economy.

What researchers measure in education research is socioeconomic status, usually in terms of income. What researchers talk about when translating income into school experiences is class. It is important to distinguish between socioeconomic factors that inhibit purchase of educational materials, services and resources, as opposed to class and cultural orientations that define school and schooling as inappropriate investments. There is a realistic concern to identify the extent to

---

10 Lewis, O. 1968. "The Culture of Poverty." In *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*, ed. D.P. Moynihan. New York: Basic Books.

11 Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

which people are in fact developing real class-consciousness about the non-efficacy of schooling, and researchers need to identify whether that exists. The new research agenda must interrogate other sources of capital, rather than just income. It is dangerous in this country to think of class merely as income and to make all kinds of assumptions based on that. This conflation between capital as material capital, capital as social capital, and capital as cultural capital is not necessary.

In future research, researchers should put human capital into the conversation because the associations between academic performance and school show the kids who have the most access to human capital *and* economic capital through their homes, communities, and the schools in combination, do the best. The association between human capital, which is what schools are in many ways primarily in the business of developing, and achievement overall is stronger than measures of financial capital. While there are levels of poverty, and the intensity of economic poverty undermines schools' capacities to be effective, researchers know beyond a certain point of getting out of economic poverty, human capital measures become significant, particularly in moving to high levels of achievement. Researchers must add better measures of human capital to what is meant by socioeconomic status. There is a tendency to avoid the category of cultural capital because scholars want intellectually to be culturally relativistic. But researchers should not avoid cultural capital because there is such a thing as a dominant culture. There is a dominant culture and part of what is considered to be a capital debility is the lack of familiarity or ability to assimilate into a particular dominant culture, even if sometimes non-dominant cultural attributes have valuable currency.

In the new research agenda, researchers should be dissuaded from classifying all income groups monolithically as classes or classify all of those who are poor, as poor in the same way. Scholars need to be more analytical in the discussion of poverty. Poverty is being treated too uniformly. One useful way to think about this is, in terms of distributions, such as probability distributions of outcomes, associated with particular combinations. Unfortunately, one of the things that have tended to be done is to treat poverty as a uniform thing that is uniformly destructive. There may be a threshold below which it is absolutely destructive, but one can be poor at some levels and not "think poor." But particularly when looking at poverty and education, research has identified those who are poor classified by virtue of being entitled to free or reduced–price lunch. Researchers also use different numbers of classes in different research analyses. Poverty must be looked at in different contexts. In measurement terms, that requires a different set of questions in survey or in ethnographic research and researchers must always define the terms they use.

Future research must take some uniform behaviors and "go up the income spectrum." Some behaviors seem to be more correlated with achievement than others. Some may not be correlated with achievement. For example, with drug abuse, some

kids are high achievers, but they still use drugs. There is a danger when researchers focus on selected outcomes that are correlated with lower class and some behaviors if isolated. Actually that behavior may exist across the class structure, but the impact of the effect is different and the ability to mediate it is different. With poverty, these behaviors are perceived differently and have different effects. Scholars cannot say parents exhibit these behaviors or that low achievement results from certain behaviors. Affluent families have ways of compensating for absent parents or drug use in ways that poor families do not. It is a distortion of the facts for researchers to conclude that poor kids have no parental oversight, and therefore they are not succeeding. It is much more complex than that.

What determines the basic classes changes over time. Also the kinds of values that are given to certain class positions changes. This extends to the way society situates the poor, so that people do not have the opportunity to have different encounters within communities. If scholars want to talk about it in terms of poverty, it is important to see this as a form of identification. In other words, it is no accident that over the last three or four years these islands of poverty grew up. In some sense it is because scholars identified a group of people as poor. Researchers have assigned certain values to them; and, therefore, within a meritocratic society, in which there is equal opportunity for those who are not middle class, there are those who have *failed*. People do not want to be associated with failure. There is a whole process which promotes identity formation processes and expectations. That is one of the reasons why future lines of research must look at this issue of poverty and school location in a different way.

Lower–class people are seen to exhibit a lower level of culture; class is not just an analytical category, it is also a form of identification—not only because a child might consider himself to be poor, and therefore there is some question about whether he or she thinks they are going to be able to achieve, but because teachers also may look at poor children and say, " Well, this is a poor kid and so I can't have high expectations." There is the idea of cultural deficit, in which poor persons are assumed to be from a particular kind of family and have a particular kind of culture, which is considered to be in deficit, and that presupposes certain levels of learning abilities.

Researchers and others use class as a shorthand term for economic relationships and values, not necessarily just income status. Part of what is needed is switching back to more kinds of conceptual issues, to get a grasp of some of these things researchers are trying to measure and relate to achievement. Researchers will not get any answers on the achievement side, even within the economic side of class, unless they conceptualize deeper. The greater proportion of poor people are working poor, and the problem is not that they do not have a job, but that they do not have a high quality job, and it is because society does not value their jobs. Future research must seriously interrogate and investigate the meaning of class in

post-industrial America; and be cognizant of the fact, or know where to find out more about it; and be cognizant of all the different levels or dimensions they need to bring to research. Economic values often get in the way of research on the one hand, and policy prescription, on the other. Many believe in their heart of hearts that people who are poor deserve to be, and believe that black people deserve to be poor because the economic system is a meritocracy, but it is not. Most of the people, probably most intellectuals, and probably most of the State believe that eliminating racial oppression and gender oppression are goals to agree upon. But eliminating class oppression is absolutely not part of the agenda.

The Concept of Gender[12]: Discussion Summary.

The panel thinks that one way of conceptualizing gender that could be more frequently used is gender as a "biological event with socially prescriptive trajectories" (Gadsden, 3/6/98 Workshop). Considerable research has focused on gender within educational and social science research over the past 30 years. Although the term and the practices and policies associated with it are a part of the national discourse, gender has been defined in relatively narrow ways. Work over the past several years continues to examine gender differences in simplistic ways but is based increasingly on expansive conceptualizations and analyses. Despite changes in the conceptualizations and the range of research, gender studies continue to be limited in their ability to deepen our understanding of the nature and intensity of gender as an asset or detractor. Panelists think that gender research has yet to form a corpus. Researchers may commonly think of gender research as American feminist analysis of social inequities; however, gender research must be broadened, and more comparative studies of gender in different contexts should be undertaken. Gender studies continue to be limited conceptually and most of the research within the past 30 years focuses on girls, typically white girls.

There are few studies that look outside of the impact of education of mothers on achievement, few on fathers' contributions, few on fathers and families, few on lesbians, gays, and bisexuals, few on the physical perils of different–gendered learners, few on divisions within and among women. Currently, there is a widening gap of education with respect to gender that must be understood. Critical analyses on male behaviors, in relationship to and separate from female behaviors, opportunities, and changing perceptions are still conspicuously absent. Perhaps the issue of greatest interest and concern, however, to many researchers of color is the absence of a rigorous or interesting discourse about people of color, e.g., African American girls or Latinas or African American boys outside of deficit models of behaviors and cognitive ability and performance (Gadsden and Smith, 1994[13]; Gadsden and Bowman, in press[14]; Myers and Dugan, 1996[15]).

---

12 This session was introduced by Dr. Vivian Gadsden.

13 Gadsden, V. L., & Smith, R. R. (1994). "African American males and fatherhood: Issues in research and practice." *Journal of Negro Education*, 63(4), 634-648.

The Concept of Gender: Recommendations for Future Research.
Panelists recommendations regarding the concept of gender in future research appear below.

- study how racism is gendered, i.e., the differences in treatment of boys and girls in different educational settings and the relations between teachers and boys and girls of different ethnic groups; study how treatment differs by race and class; for example, study the punishment and criminalization of black children and develop strategies for mitigating more negative feedback to boys;
- study the heightened affective level that exists when educators interact with students of color and the underdevelopment of interaction on the cognitive basis; study experiences and interactions of teachers and students of all ages and of different genders, especially the gender of K-5 teachers and the impact of male teachers in schools;
- study not only differential treatment but also differential expectations and differential peer pressure on boys and girls as well as differential placement of boys and girls;
- study how black males' and females' human capital is undervalued in the labor market, how they are not compensated according to achievement, and how the informal economy compensates;
- study how society devalues social reproduction, nurturing, and raising children as economic agents; better understand the political economic term "social reproduction" and how society values (or undervalues) that process and the people (usually mothers and teachers) who are left to handle it.
- study welfare rights and reproductive behavior;
- study ambiguous gender identity and countersocial gender identity;
- study what changes occur for different age groups and what does not; for example, determine if is there an age by which children decide if they will succeed;
- deconstruct emergent masculinity and femininity and how it is that patriarchy is internalized in masculinity and femininity and in masculine status and feminine status;
- study the math and science perceptions of different gendered teachers and the possibility of math fear being passed on to students;
- identify students' expectations of different gendered teachers, and expectations and reactions of teachers from different genders;
- study the impact of uniforms and same sex schools or same sex classrooms on the gender gaps in academic achievement;

---

[14] Gadsden, V. L., & Bowman, P. (in press). "Poor African American males and the struggle toward responsible fatherhood." In V. Polite & J. Davis (Eds.), *A continuing challenge in times like these: African American males in school and society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

[15] Myers, D. J., & Dugan, K. B. (1996). "Sexism in graduate school classrooms: Consequences for students and faculty." *Gender and Society*, 10(3), 330-350.

- incorporate the gender dimension in evaluation of impact of school reform and applied school improvement efforts;
- study the widening gap of females to males in college;
- determine if the race or the gender of the teacher in the classroom impacts achievement and learning;
- critically analyze male behaviors in relationship to and separate from female behaviors in schools and gendered opportunities and changing perceptions along with a rigorous or interesting discourse about people of color.

The Concept of Gender: Discussion Excerpts -- Context and Concepts.
Below appear excerpts from the Workshop discussion relevant to the above recommendations.

The research agenda needs to include what is going on in the schools at that particular level and not rely only on a deficit model of students' capabilities. Research should examine how different students are treated, and researchers must think about strategies to prevent the treatment of certain children on an affective versus cognitive basis. There are anecdotes that the kinds of professional development activities that teachers go through are those to be endured and even feed bias against certain groups and feed stereotypes. What differences exist in the treatment of boys and girls at different points in schooling and how this treatment is affected by race and classes? Future research must involve more rigorous investigation of the treatment and expectations of boys in particular, particularly low income African American and Latino and Native American boys, and a similar body of research that looks at girls.

As said with regards to race and class, gender is also constructed and socially dynamic. Furthermore, gender is not just girls; gender is a continuum, and there are, what appears to researchers, types of ambiguous gender identity and counter social gender identity.

Changes in families and in parents' roles have received modest attention in research. One exception includes analyses of topics such as cooperative parenting, which still show that despite the increases in mothers' employment, mothers continue to assume the responsibilities of children and household tasks. There are few studies that provide good conceptual or empirical analyses on mothers, outside of looking at mothers' education as a variable that affects children's achievement. There are a lot of studies that talk about the role of mothers in adult children's psychopathology, and so there is a lot of blame, but no research that allows researchers to go into the literature and look at it proactively. Second, contributions and potential contributions of fathers in children's achievement or stability are minimally examined. Third, the complex relationships among gender, sexual preferences and the effects and implications of labels, such as lesbian and gay, will require increasing attention. Fourth, research fails to

examine gender and its impact over the life course, within and outside of educational structures. Although there are some studies, they focus on college-aged students and graduate students or on faculty members. Not even here, however, is there a big portrait of what the problems are, what changes have resulted with what options, and what the effects have been for women with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

Gender is still a landmine, because the diversity between and among women is often ignored; diverse social and cultural contexts and the access of information, knowledge and structures that promote mathematical and science ability, athletic ability, and social status among girls and women could be studied further as well. There also is little about policies that allow tracking or monitoring of the implementation. Many evaluations do not analyze impact by gender. Not much is known about the distribution of reforms by gender. The research agenda needs a clear gender dimension to evaluation of school reform strategies and their impacts on academic achievement, and for males that is as crucial in language arts as it has been for women in science and math.

Boys get much more negative treatment than girls do in the home. The behavior that evokes it takes place in an environment in which boys are more physically active and parents are tired. Furthermore for children who differ by race, but are the same sex, who get into trouble in school, the consequences are fundamentally different. Black children get punished, white children do not. And just as black male boys may be increasingly criminalized around the 3rd and 4th grade in terms of how schools respond to them; the situation may also be true of black females.

Black and white boys are found to be equally disruptive in classrooms. However, when teachers interact with white boys, they interact with white boys around content, around intellectual issues. When they interact with black boys, it is around discipline. A subtle message is given to black boys that their intellectual, cognitive ability is less important than the ways in which they do strongly physically in the classroom.

What is going on with black girls has something to do with how notions of black femininity are being rearranged by this new explosion of expressive (black) culture based on a kind of resistant black masculinity. The future research agenda needs to begin to deconstruct the cultural messages about masculinity that seem to have some significant implications for boys and girls.

For black males in the marketplace, particularly in the labor market, having educational credentials does not help them much. Black males' human capital achievements are not valued equally in the labor market. It seems there is a direct logical consequence of the unequal value in terms of how they are actually compensated, in terms of wages and wealth. They are not compensated for these achievements. They are also not valued in the sense that they do not get jobs.

Being underpaid, underemployed, and unemployed. They can probably get compensated better in the informal economy. Why stay in school or why achieve in school?

Studies find 2nd and 3rd graders are clear about how much they are engaged in the classroom, how well they are being treated. It appears that something happens when children reach the age of about 10; they decide whether they are going to succeed. Children map what has happened to them from grades one through five or six onto their sense of the world and the lack of opportunity, and they make decisions that "this is not a useful thing for me," and they tend to drop out before they get into 9th grade.

For black women, while there is some increasing of their opportunities so that they are more likely to get a job than a black male (society may be giving them some compensation so that they are doing a little better), there is still no addressing of other issues of how to balance and manage being a professional or even having a job and raising a family. Whereas society has not eased any of the traditional responsibilities, it has added more, and researchers have not figured out a way to help manage or balance that, or to even recognize it. There is a need to be attentive to the nurturing and raising of economic agents who are the children in society. Researchers and society at large must determine how to better value nurturing and the needed reproduction of a social population who will be society's economic agents.

III. Sessions 4-5: The Analyses of Isolated and Interactional Effects of Race, Gender, and Class

Isolated and Interactional Effects of Race, Gender, and Class[16]: Discussion Summary.

Panelists suggest that research explore the basis of any similarities in the patterns of educational inequality that are in fact identifiable by class, race or gender, but go beyond the isolated categories and factors (because people actually all reside mainly in the intersections). Research should extend attention to joint categorical memberships, certain kinds of status inconsistency, and the challenge of status integration when people reside at different points on these different dimensions. It is important that researchers understand that the intersection of class, race and gender status are important to the incumbents residing in these intersections, both subjectively, and in interaction with others. Panelists warn that the challenges of doing research that incorporates the intersections is that it courts the danger of seeing no differences in race, class, and gender as isolated categories and in seeing no difference between the differences.

Isolated and Interactional Effects: Recommendations for Future Research.

Panelists' recommendations regarding isolated and interactional effects in future research appear below:

- Develop a particular theory in the intersection between race, gender, and class. (For example, it seems that thinking about how race is gendered in this society is important);
- Develop data collection for subpopulation analysis and 3-way analysis;
- Study what difference society makes of people who reside in these categories, and what difference society makes of these categories;
- Understand what educators are taught and prepared to understand about race, gender, and class, and how that orients and forms what they do;
- Help students with the need to understand that any one or combination of their ascriptive attributes may be the cause of their experiences and prepare students to confront each positively;
- Determine how to stabilize families facing harsh economic conditions, find a setting or two to stabilize, determine what is needed scale of investment, and invest and study;
- Identify how to build supplementary education, shadow education; peer networks, academic orientation learning communities and supplementary strategies for education and high performance, i.e., supplementary education program development;
- Determine how one might help build coalitions between marginalized groups who have access to limited resources;

---

[16] These sessions were introduced by Dr. William Trent (Isolated Effects) and Mr. Scott Miller (Interactional Effects).

- Study how individual students navigate or how different models come to dominate particular schools in terms of process; study decisions made on the part of young people to utilize the educational opportunities that are available to them, given that they reside in these different categories;
- Study the process under which certain populations are privileged; there should be a polity capital research agenda which asks "who is a member?" from the larger society standpoint and "who thinks of themselves as a member?" and studies the kinds of resources committed by the society as a result of membership, and the kinds of commitments individuals make as a result of membership and nonmembership;
- Study how differently situated people with respect to class are informed and access accurate, current, thorough, complete information that is useful; model and support research that enables educators to transcend these different contexts with students;
- Research the political economy of the information flow and translate the findings and interpretation to a broader, general American public policy;
- Study how women, and particularly white women, have made significant advances in science, engineering, and medicine; what is it about lowering these kinds of barriers with essentially white women, and what can educators learn from that?;
- Look more at the interaction between race and class; for example, determine what are the causes of lower and higher achievement for higher SES individuals and what are the reasons for high and low achievement for low SES individuals;
- Develop a research and policy agenda asking about trans-border considerations, migration, and immigration.

Isolated and Interactional Effects: Discussion Excerpts -- Context and Concepts. Below appear excerpts from the Workshop discussion relevant to the above recommendations.

> When researchers look at high academic achievement— meaning doing very well by how schools evaluate academic performance in schools, grades, standardized test scores— they hope behind good grades are high levels of intellective competence. So, from a research vantagepoint grades and test scores are imperfect measures of the ability to think well. Using these measures, however imperfect, if researchers think about achievement among racial and ethnic groups, the first thing seen are very different distributions of academic achievement, beginning early and remaining similar throughout. As for distribution, some groups are heavily over represented at the top of the academic achievement distribution and significantly under represented at the bottom.

> Although researchers have not actually collected a lot of data historically that allows thinking about the interaction of race, class, and gender, there are very large academic achievement gaps within social class. The 1994 NAEP Reading Report[17] produced a table which showed that African-American 17 year-olds with

---

[17] Re NAEP:

at least one parent with a college degree had a lower average than white counterparts with no parent with a high school diploma. With race, ethnicity and parent education level, income shows roughly similar patterns with some variations. When taking gender into account in this mix, it gets quite complex. First, research has not done much of it. NAEP also cut data perhaps never seen before by gender and ethnicity, and parent education level across three grades. What did it show? It showed boys in all three ethnic categories significantly lagged girls in the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grades, significantly lagged the girls in average reading scores at all three grades, and the gaps were large in real terms.

One issue that points to the need to look at interactions in future research is that boys tend to have more diagnosed learning disabilities. There is some reason to believe that there is at least some truth to the fact that they do, though there may be some over diagnosis. Researchers and educators need to be sensitized to what it means to have more physiologically grounded obstacles to learning to read for boys and for girls, and researchers need to take class into consideration. Middle-class families probably do better with obstacles because they have resources to pour into addressing them.

The sample size on the 1994 NAEP reading test is not large enough to do three-way analysis. There is no table combining parent education level, ethnicity, and gender, but researchers are testing more subjects more frequently within fixed budgets with smaller samples. There probably should be testing in fewer subjects at longer intervals, in order to have larger samples.

There are some other ways to assess intellective competence. Take a specific case, Texas, 1995 old SAT norms, combined SAT average per black males with at least one parent with a graduate degree, 795. That is something well beyond a disaster; but scholars do not actually know anything about these young men and how they think in an academic setting, what their experiences are in school, or what their peer relationships are. All that is known is it does not look good. Studies are needed to help understand factors that are associated with the inability of African-American families in particular to transfer their successes on to their children. That is a real and fundamental question, and whether that has to do with a history of exclusion and reticence about participating in activities that are associated with intellectual development early on or not is an open question. If researchers were going to be serious about this, future studies would have to start drawing large samples that would give a better picture of subpopulations.

This is the federal government's National Assessment of Educational Progress testing program that produces "report cards" on student achievement on an ongoing basis, based on subject area tests of national (and to some extent state) samples of students.

Because researchers have not examined the differences among racial and ethnic groups over time, researchers do not know nearly as much as they should. Much remains to be known. There are differences in grades and differences in test scores, but what does that mean? In addition, because scholars do not know what percentages are second and third generation college graduates, there is no idea about duration in the middle class and how that relates to this. There is more to know about immigrant status. Only with large enough samples with sophisticated enough instruments at the statistical level will researchers learn the subpopulation entry points. A substantial qualitative research agenda on basically all aspects of the students' lives must follow because even though some of these within social class gaps have closed in the databases over the years, they may not have been closing much over the last decade.

How many reports speak about the impact of the interventions on any subpopulations other than poor kids in general or maybe poor minority kids, some poor minority group? That is the status of our capacity to do subpopulation evaluation of educational improvement efforts. Most of the intervention strategies have been basically targeted at these populations, so what is known about how variations of success for all might work in communities with large numbers of stable blue-color and emerging middle-class African-American or Mexican-American students? This would suggest for a Board like this to free up some money to fund very quickly some reasonably conceptualized school improvement strategies that are deliberately targeted to some additional subpopulations if possible. Drawing upon the best information that can be pulled together now that would be a terrific thing for this body to do.

Strong academically oriented peer networks make a difference in outcomes. Educators and society must try to build supplementary educational institutions that would be doing several things simultaneously, not the least of which is getting academic success and strong peer networks going early on, and the ability to get into new ones at the next step. Dick Light's research[18] at Harvard shows that half the students at Harvard are in substantial academically oriented learning communities very quickly. The best students have learned that is a big part of being successful. With a devastatingly bad job market, highly mobile families and children and a set of dire economic circumstances, and it gets intergenerational, in the most difficult settings, the schools are not able to cope with reform strategies. Not much is known about how to deliver supplementary strategies for high performance to large numbers of these students.

So, a research agenda should ask "how to stabilize people under circumstances which cross deeply held economic and other ideologies of the society?" With regard to school reform for the most disadvantaged, researchers must invest in a deliberate

---

[18] Richard Light, 1992 Harvard Assessment Seminar.

overinvestment model and find some communities to see what happens if overinvestment intervention stabilizes the disadvantaged clientele. When Slavin[19] talks about investing twice as much, he may be close to right. Though society is not ideologically close to embracing that, there is no reason why empirically researchers cannot run the experiment.

To get deep broad public consensus around almost anything except the most threatening of events may not be not realistic. Social scientists must say to people "if you think a bad school system isn't going to hit you in your front and backyard when these kids are dropping out of school and are hanging out in the streets and the malls, everybody is going to be affected. It is not even about radical politics, it is about basic sense of security, so that's why I'm interested in public schools because it has enormous impact for everybody whether your kids are in it or not. It is a part of our society and our community." A research agenda, must involve sound bites, and help people figure out what mechanisms they have at hand at the margin to make a difference.

Since politics is involved, researchers need to worry about being too power neutral when recommending supplementary education strategies. Unless scholars understand what the politics is, they cannot strategize about how to change the situations technically, but also need to strategize how to do the politics necessary to get these changes implemented and so there has got to be both sides of these situations. It is similar to needing more research in the policies of dissemination of educational research. There is a political economy, and scholars must remember it's not just that research failed to do it, there are reasons why research has not been able to do it. Also, some topics are always left out of research, why are these things not addressed? There is an issue here of sociology of knowledge.

Technological change and the patterns of reproduction that have ensued over the last 200 years have meant that there have been systematically more people with few skills seeking jobs that require low skills. The migrations and interactions of disparate groups on unequal terms in highly dynamic circumstances have been extraordinary, and educators are trying to make progress in these highly dynamic conditions.

Educators trying to understand from a policy standpoint what investments need to be made, need a rolling picture of the ability to provide economically stable employment through market processes, and of what is likely to be the case in the future. There is a need for macro educational policy analysis tied to understanding how the match between the distribution of jobs that are likely to be

---

[19] Robert E. Slavin "Success For All" -- Lee Conmigo (Johns Hopkins) Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools 3505 North Charles Street Baltimore MD 21218. 1-800-548-4998.

generated matches up to the people that are both here, there, and coming. Future research needs to understand stability of communities and it relates to academic performance of students in these communities. Future research needs to understand the conditions of racism in public arenas that make them less psychologically accessible, and that is tough. Researchers also need to understand policy concatenation. The research agenda must examine the confluence of multiple policies and how these are "bumping into each other."

There must be an applied research agenda to look very carefully at how promising strategies can be implemented realistically in stressful environments. Good research that will enable realistic discussion about who is likely to be reached and who is not is necessary. When researchers look at the evaluation of the impact on kids, they have to eliminate the highly mobile youngsters. There is a need for analysis of what can be implemented realistically and what that best implementation will actually lead to in the way of kids served, in environments characterized by an inadequate supply of adequately paying jobs with lots of low skilled people coming to the world, highly mobile and poor.

IV. The Theoretical and Methodological Criteria for a New Educational Research Agenda

Theory and Method: Discussion Summary.
While panelists make it clear they are not suggesting that better schooling is unimportant, improved schooling and research aimed at that may not be a full remedy to underachievement. Panelists think that there are not only methodological and theoretical but political challenges to improving educational research and education. They highlighted areas of research that have not been addressed for political reasons, such as missed dimensions of racism and under-development of appropriate methods to capture institutional racism. Panelists hold that methodology must be developed to demonstrate racism; racism is currently a residual, measured by default, despite the need for better measurement. Several panelists indicate that researchers should at the least look to anthropology to provide an alternative method to the statistical residual since anthropology has looked at racism in studies outside the United States.

Panel members would like to see more research that is qualitative and quantitative, interdisciplinary, and applied. They ask for research that uses developmental dimensions and longitudinal, intergenerational, multi-generational, and comparative frameworks, and appropriate ethnographic conceptualization. They would like studies that investigate multiple versus single factors as critical and multiple statuses yielding combined results in experiences, that examine multiple contexts and conjoint categorical memberships since that is where most people are most of the time. They also identify a need for research that makes local, community and transnational connections. Panelists would like to see more state level research, small surveys, larger sample surveys, critical, detailed ethnographic studies, and more ethnographic oral history work. More attention must be paid to kinds of guidance needed to enter schools and study groups. For example, panelists warned that researchers must be aware both in statistical and ethnographic approaches that membership in one group may not preempt discrimination due to another membership. In addition, researchers must not overlook issues that revolve around allocative forces and allocation versus socialization, i.e., who does research and who does funding.

Theory and Method: Recommendations for Future Research.
Panelists recommendations regarding theory and method in future research appear below:

- Do large surveys that incorporate variables such as: understanding of language, parents' levels of and time spent on reading and writing, and percentage 2nd or 3rd generation college graduates; redefine "SES" to 2nd generation SES; use wealth, income history, and educational history instead of income and education; and use "perceived opportunity" since it is a close concomitant of social capital;
- Add dimensions to research and data collection such as: bilingualism outside schools, language distribution across communities, systematicity of language across class, and

intergenerational transmission of language; add measures of mobility in research design research; expand the notion of significant others beyond parents and teachers;

- Interrogate the notion of class and undertake longitudinal studies of values that are conflated with class and use findings to sensitize to such conflation; add wealth and perceptions of opportunity, issues of linguistic features as a non-income based way of looking at class; redress the issue that the only social class marker at most state-level data sets is free or reduced lunch and non-free or reduced lunch;
- Interrogate the use of certain labels with respect to class, race and gender; for example, interrogate the label of "learning disabled";
- Examine the notion of community, and design studies that gather information on the multiple communities that people reside in and on what community is (since it is not fixed in one location);
- Broaden the notion of gender, for example, to ambiguous gender and countersocial gender;
- Beware of the conflation of "not learning" with "can't learn" with "not demonstrating learning";
- Critically examine the role of language; the relationship between language competence and outcomes is not yet understood; avoid dismissing the language dimension in research simply because it is complex; clearly define what language competence related to outcomes means, or how it can be measured to validate it;
- Incorporate awareness of learning processes and developmental dimensions in research design because children first "learn to read" but later need to "read in order to learn"; for example, before age four may be the best window of opportunity for teaching reading, but researchers need to know how often this window is missed;
- Adopt a dynamic and historical perspective in research, i.e., one that recognizes the changing nature of relationships of race, class, and gender; though scholars identify different traditions and different ethnicities and their particular unique relations to this society, these change;
- Find ways to examine long-term effects and cumulative effects; for example, examine cumulative effects of no schools in certain communities, cumulative effects of racism, and of concentration of poverty in various manifestations;
- Develop research of the sociology of knowledge on dimensions of racism and find new methods to capture institutional racism and use in-depth ethnography as needed to do that;
- Design studies that take into account complex matrices of networks that may have marked effects on achievement; for example, instead of only looking at schools, research should explore the complex issues of networks and government agencies and labor markets which may have a macro effect on achievement;
- Attend to broader systemic approaches that analyze systems beyond traditional school; scrutinize the broader system; in particular, look at a community and family as part of that broader system;
- Study configuration aspects of learning such as: the role of sports, the role of various kinds of media infrastructures, and the role of religious organizations;

- Attend to contextual dimensions in research design; for example, study how schools are integrated into community systems;
- Explore linkages in greater detail; for example, identify the nature of the link between language competence and academic outcomes;
- Make a distinction in research between process of differentiation and form of differentiation;
- Learn from other disciplines and use interdisciplinary approaches; for example, those who are submitting proposals for research around specific educational issues must demonstrate in their proposal familiarity with the literature on the community they propose to study from a broad spectrum.
- Attend to translation and application of research; for example, in teacher training, examine institutional, structural, micro, and new macro dimensions.

Theory and Method: Discussion Excerpts -- Context and Concepts.
Below appear excerpts from the Workshop discussion relevant to the above recommendations.

> Again, researchers should think about processes. In a sense, this indicates a paradigm shift. Race, class, and gender are seen as exogenous variables with no prior cause. They are not caused by the environment. One is born into each. A person has no choice about them. However, they are acted upon. They are coded and constructed. Researchers do not just think of a biological thing, they think of behavior when they think of race, gender, and class. Race is not primarily a skin color or a biological or genetic thing, although popularly it is still perceived that way. Perhaps researchers should pay more attention to some other variables that might be more powerful than race, class, and gender. In other words, these might be specifying variables. What are the other key variables that act on race class, and gender? Are there structures? When researchers think about structures there are choices of paradigms. Are there structures within which people operate as agents which create a culture which is problematic? Or are there structures imposed upon people within which people operate, and how does the culture that they are creating for themselves make it possible for them to survive within the context of these structures? There are other ways of seeing this as well, but research would benefit if it were more mindful of the latter at least.

> Future research must talk about the political economy and the power structures; education and anything else is also economic. Power affects a lot that happens on an individual level because of economic structures, constructs and institutional racism. Include these areas and these perceptions in research methodology and conscious; incorporate structural dimensions and more complex modeling; look at process as not only being "economic, political and social" but being quite synchronic processes. Researchers are more comfortable examining individual perceptions and experiences as opposed to the institutional side and also as opposed to the process. Though researchers need to focus on individuals, on who

people are and where people are, researchers must fix attention on the structural dimensions of inequality.

A major determining structural factor is how the human resources of each group are used, misused, or ignored. How can researchers define and understand and track these structures and the way they impact on each group, in order to create the basic intellectual and political framework for a civil society that transcends these limits which are so arguably cultivated by the people who say they want them to disappear? What are the of devices that are used to do this: physical violence, structural violence and procedural violence. Both of these are operative modes of establishing rights with which they are marginalizing very specific groups. Researchers can take the structural violence to include things like lack of shelter, lack of employment, lack of access to health benefits, denial of competent education, assimilation, cultural devaluation, environmental discrimination, alienation from community, disproportionate arrests, language. Future work can catalog all of these, and they need to be monitored as part of the examination of each particular group at each particular moment, region and context in which these things are going on.

There are several kinds of evidence used regarding class and human capital. Researchers estimate crudely certain kinds of skill levels and how skill levels associate with credential levels and wages. Researchers examine the relationship between skill levels, educational attainment levels, and personality attributes to performance in employment settings of various kinds. The kinds of things researchers are talking about in terms of human capital are poor surrogates for what can be considered to be the important aspects of class as status and how they vary in some children. Future research must speak about social capital which has to do with one's status within a social network, and one's ability to mobilize that network on one's behalf.

What does it mean to be middle class simply by measure by SES? A person could be in a family where others are still below the poverty line and he or she happens to earn an income right above that SES, or may be the first generation in a large extended family to get to a higher level. What does language minority mean? Researchers throw everybody into the same pool if English is not their primary language, but what if English is not a person's primary language, but he or she comes highly literate in a second language because his or her family is highly educated. Language minority also is a diverse category; researchers should conceptualize and use these categories in a different way and not use the kind of terminology that researchers have been accustomed to, because that gets researchers thinking in a way that is not productive. There is a need to redefine such concepts and determine what is comparable.

Future research must examine the idea of community today because it is not what researchers used to think. Increasingly people live in one community, and they

have their work and business in another one, and that complicates their own, their life experience and the ways they look at these institutions. The study of Kessler's[20] has broader application, that helps us get at notions of gender by doing the kind of work that involves us in the multiple communities that people reside in. So much of the work has been in the school setting, but understanding that kids live in communities and that significant others may be at YMCA or YWCA and that they are critical role players in how kids come to understand the function of school. The function of learning may reside in places other than the home.

An idea that can help methodologically is the paradigm of "all levels," i.e., researchers can conceptualize what is happening at different levels, in other words the individual, the family, the peer group, the classroom, our analyses, and the use of different methodologies, but it should be an interactional thing. What are the processes by which groups get racialized, perhaps in terms of the advantaged or the disadvantaged? Use a paradigm that shows interaction over time.

Future research should gather data differently. Future research should broaden the contexts examined, increase the depth and detail, add new measures for background characteristics, but also aim for consistency across data gathering efforts. One example of this would be to examine broad ethnic and racial categories and disaggregate them into minimally ethnic groups. If there is such a reformulation of how the data are collected, there still has to be some consistency in these data sets.

One more recommendation is that the Department of Education consider ways in which it can refine its articulation with state collected data, because providing an incentive for some similarities and data collection design that looks in-depth at the quality of experience that achieving and underachieving youth have in school may yield large benefits. Two students can be in the same high school and get two totally different sets of experiences, and NAEP data, ACT and College Board data only scratch the surface in both of these areas. Furthermore, the development of the sociology of knowledge of the measurement of racism must be across disciplines. In anthropology, for example, if anthropologists looked at the fact of racism in other places earlier, that might yield a methodology for looking at

---

[20] Kessler, S., Ashenden, S.J., Connell, R.W., and Bowsett, G.W. 1985. "Gender Relations in Secondary Schooling." *Sociology of Education*, 58(January), pp. 34-48.

Notes provided by William Trent: This article seeks to present the competing forces that shape gender understandings and choices for 14 and 15 year old Australian women of working and ruling class backgrounds. In doing so, it challenges the hegemony of strong socialization by emphasizing human agency and power relations and the imbeddedness of individuals in social networks, the components of which may be quite dissimilar and hence a potential source of inconsistent and incompatible messages. This kind of example makes it easier to talk about continuity between parts of the socialization components in a social network and how consistency could be a powerful shaper of values.

subtle racism. Right now, studies control for everything else and whatever is left must be racism.

Future research can use classroom ethnography to demonstrate how children experience education in a racialized situation and to ethnographically describe the experience of these racisms. But how do researchers observe what they are not accustomed to observing and not taught or trained to observe? A researcher has to be trained to be an observer and also a critical thinker. Ethnography and observation take serious training. There is a distinction between ethnography and the appropriation of ethnography by other disciplines without the real training of ethnography.

There are things that happen outside of school, home, community, that enable schooling to work, and educational research needs to pay as much attention to these things as to what happens inside of schools. The teaching and learning context has to do with the quality of resources and that attitudinal complex, but also has to do with the surrounding context that delivers reason to students to engage, to decide to partake and to fully engage themselves. Schooling is not unimportant, and it can be improved, but it may be that even if it were perfect, it wouldn't solve the problem.

Furthermore, this is not only a knowledge production issue. This is a political issue. For example, researchers know more about language and bilingualism than currently gets used, and it does not get used for political reasons. This may have indications for the rest of the advice to the Board.

One of the most important measures educational research should benefit from is a look at the relevant research in other disciplines. An interesting application would be some of the new economic work on governance and workplace democracy issues. Scholarly work needs inter-disciplinary team efforts, well defined strategies for policy definition and implementation, a directed cooperation of community participants at every stage, a carving out of appropriate spaces within the university, and a broad reach across the bounds of race, ethnic, gender and class sectors, along with local, regional and especially trans-national connections. There are aspects of teacher preparation that would benefit greatly from innovative efforts from the spectrum of social science, disciplinary based research in universities. Researchers must call on people of other disciplines to work together and to work with communities, to explore more seriously what is happening in communities and what is happening in schools in certain communities.

When you think about inter-disciplinary work, the reality is that it is extremely hard work, and people bring not only disciplinary perspectives on how problems are thought about and studied, but often very narrow ideas. As scholars talk about inter-disciplinary work, researchers should consider how to approach, what kinds

of information, and what kinds of guidance people outside of schools of education and within schools of education need to have, and scholars should think about how research enters schools and studies children.

While researchers should be sympathetic to the idea of taking a new look at the macro aspect, to a certain extent, the macro is almost not explanatory; it reveals that something is going on, and that these issues are problematic, but it does not, for example, show that there is less investment in schools in the black community than there is in the white community. Even when researchers assume that race is the mediating factor, how race plays that mediating role is not always clear. In order to fill in the cultural aspect of the relationship between agency, structure and individuals, researchers must examine how people think about racial and other differences, how people who are implementing policy are thinking about what their policy is doing, and how the people who are on the receiving end are seeing these things.

V. The Applied Substance of a New Educational Research Agenda

An Applied Educational Research Agenda: Panelists' Goals.
The panelists' recommendations are informed by several goals including:

- improving the academic achievement of all students irrespective of race, gender, and class;
- uncoupling the correlation of race, gender, and class with academic achievement;
- deconstructing the systemic reproduction of subordination and disempowerment by race, gender, and class;
- recognizing the rapid pluralization and differentiation of groups in society and in local, metropolitan, and rural communities;
- recognizing the nuances of and changes in how race, gender, and class are experienced;
- recognizing the role of the social consciousness of groupness and emergent groupness in developed capabilities; and
- developing labeling strategies that are meaningful and speak to daily experiences as well as useful for counting and categorizing.

An Applied Educational Research Agenda: Recommendations for Research.
Panelists' recommendations regarding an applied educational research agenda in the future appear below:

- study who teachers are and who will become teachers;
- study teacher preparation and training and the ideas and expectations teachers hold about different learners and how training may feed bias against groups; determine if teacher preparation should take place in schools of education and what schools of education do;
- study what schools of education are doing with knowledge and research;
- study to what extent research is being translated and applied to teacher training;
- study if cultural understanding and multicultural fluency enable better teaching and if they are taught as pedagogical skills to teachers;
- study how to change teachers' attitudes, including changing attitudinal structures and conscious and unconscious perceptions;
- determine how to screen teachers for open-mindedness, especially when most teachers know how to be politically correct regarding diversity;
- determine how to support new teachers who try to enact changes;
- study how teachers' home contexts, larger publics, and older teachers interfere with the translation of research into school reform practices and how they can be impacted; study if society provides a sufficiently intense experience in the training and preparation of teachers so that they are able to exercise and use these understandings irrespective of the larger social context in which they live;
- reveal what schools do to sort students by race, class, and gender by the middle grades;

- identify the structures that impact learning; identify what it is about the nature of schooling and learning and teaching that begins in the middle grades and high school that may be inherent in our school and classroom practices as well as district policies that accentuate some of the differences of race, class, and gender in achievement; study how educators and policy-makers understand these differences, and do research that may develop interventions that begin to shift these structures;
- integrate what can be learned from different disciplines into teacher education;
- identify student expectations of teachers;
- study access to mechanisms of social control that allow teachers to have the standard of legitimate authority that teachers had before;
- study the dialogue about course choices and attempts to make parents partners; foster involvement of all parents of all classes, races, and genders in a dialogue about educational choices;
- identify linkages between the kind of barriers that are set up, criteria for eligibility for certain courses, and entry to community college and higher education;
- look at the alignment between the curriculum and the assessment;
- examine what kids are being taught, what they do, and what schools do, and curriculum issues such as the multi-cultural component;
- develop a thoughtful applied syntheses for policy purposes on opportunity and educational programs for people for whom English is not the primary language;
- explore vertical teaming initiatives.

An Applied Educational Research Agenda: Discussion Excerpts -- Context and Concepts.

Below appear excerpts from the Workshop discussion relevant to the above recommendations.

> Research needs to study not only what the students do and how they are doing, but also what the schools are doing. Are there non-traditional interventions that are working, restructurings, and certain types of schools that teach well the children people worry about? For whom are they working well? How replicable are they? Fellow panelists discussed teacher education and evaluating teachers, and what happens to good teachers in bad schools; but did not say much about the institutions themselves. Is it not more important that the schools and their teachers learn to teach whomever they are given, rather than that they are given ideal, uniform children that anyone can teach? Researchers could still be dealing with the issue of identifying the levels of failure in school right now and the degree to which kids are actually taught and taught well in different contexts, i.e., are there high expectations for children in the inner city of Philadelphia, similar to those of children in Bryn Mawr? This area includes teachers and teaching environments, school organization, community systems and services, and allocation of resources.

> There are the issues of teacher preparation, the teaching force, and the teaching environment. Students perform poorly in the math and science areas, as NAEP

data suggest. Systematically, progress is hampered in the early years when the science and math perceptions and self-conceptions of young women, who make up most of our teaching force, should be improving. As a result; often all of our kids are turned over to teachers who themselves have been victims of math fear and math apprehension.

Researchers must understand how teachers are prepared and what conceptions they hold about the capabilities of learners. Future research must find a way to better integrate what can be learned from the other disciplines into how teachers are prepared. Researchers might create a screening instrument to select people into the teaching profession who start out with the kinds of values that will help them to serve all kids?

Testing should not be done in a vacuum. Educators should not only be looking at official tests that kids take, but should be looking at assessment and accountability from a classroom perspective. There should be small-scale studies that would be implemented to examine the relationship between how teachers are assessing students, the curriculum that they are teaching, and the standards.

While future research should be interested in the decisions that the teachers make, future research should be interested in going to another level, to what the norms of a school are. Often the norms for the school suggest that "these kids who are such and such should be subordinate." A teacher can be trained very well, but once he or she gets in the context of that school, those norms influence their practice. There may be no thinking that offsets these norms in a positive way. How can research help prevent teachers from conforming to the norms of that school structure they enter?

Data are often given in benchmarks like fourth grade, eighth grade, twelfth grade, in other words, by the way public education is organized. The organization of public education sometimes results in poor hand-offs of students from one grade or level to the next with minimal communication. Here is a schoolhouse perspective on the way to overinvest; it might be in the K-12 articulation with teachers, and the impact of having teachers take ownership of students across a 6-12 continuum. Invest in the articulation of teacher's ownership of kids across the continuum and the potential impact of that vertical stability. The College Board has a vertical teaming initiative in many of the core areas that can serve as a model. There is an incentive for teachers to articulate, and there is a reward for eventual success as seniors in the classes in terms of success, but that incentive is distributed all the way to the sixth grade teacher.

It is important to understand that different communities learn different things about how they are regarded. There are neighborhoods that have persistently received the poorest delivery of any list of services that can be identified. What do bright people learn as a consequence of having their communities treated that way?.

John McKnight's work[21] is a very interesting attempt to examine the notion, that one of the major problems of our oppressed communities is the fact that communities are taken over by schools which are over-professionalized and social services which are over-professionalized.

There are key players who make allocation decisions about assigning children across categories of learning that shape the opportunity to learn. What this suggests is that the new research agenda needs to understand how these people come to make decisions. There is a need for an applied education policy research effort, in which group identity and group position, of which race is one way to describe identity, is centrally situated in research. Future study must improve the analytic and policy pertinence of data collected, and downplay the competition for access to programs and services. What does it take to persuade a growing number of professional Asians who are now living in mostly white suburbs that indeed like their mostly white professionals that society ought to be investing $2 perhaps ($2 for every $1 invested in our own kids) in poor kids in Newark, most of whom happen to be socially classified as African American? The new research agenda must include study of how group identity and attitude structure and other kinds of information might lead to clearer policy-making.

---

21 McKnight, C.C., Crosswhite, J.A., Dossey, J.A., Kifer, E., Swafford, S.O., Travers, K.J. & Cooney, T.J. (1987). *The underachieving curriculum: Assessing U.S. school mathematics from an international perspective.* Champaign, IL: Stipes.

VI. Suggested Readings

Each panelist provided selected readings to serve as resources on the topics discussed at The Workshop. These are listed below.

Baron, Harold M. (1969). "Appendix: The Web of Urban Racism." in *Institutional Racism in America*, Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Previtt (Eds.), NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., pp. 135-176.

Bates, Timothy. 1995. "Rising Skill Levels and Declining Labor Force Status Among African-American Males." *Journal of Negro Education*, 64(3), 373-383.

Campbell, J. R. et al, 1996. *NAEP 1994 Reading Report Card for the Nation and the States.* Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education.

Cordero-Guzman, Hector R. "Why Do Some Children Score Higher than Others? An Empirical Study of the Role of Family, School, and Community Level Resources on Racial/Ethnic Differences in Standardized Test Scores (AFQT)." Paper presented on January 3, 1998 at the panel on "Race and Labor Market Outcomes: A New Look," National Economic Association (Allied Social Sciences Annual Meeting), Chicago, IL.

Darity, William A., Jr. "Programmed Retardation and the Theory of Noncompeting Groups." Working paper, Department of Economics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, May 1997.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. 1995. "Cracks in the bell curve: How education matters." *The Journal of Negro Education,* 64(3), 340-353.

Fashola, Olatokunbo S. And Slavin, Robert E. 1997. "Promising Programs for Elementary and Middle Schools: Evidence of Effectiveness and Replicability." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 2(3), 251-306.

Freeman, Harold P. 1998. "The Meaning of Race in Science-Considerations for Cancer Research: Concerns of Special Populations in the National Cancer Program." *Cancer*, 82(1), American Cancer Society, 219-225.

Gadsden, V. L., & Bowman, P. (in press). "Poor African American males and the struggle toward responsible fatherhood." In V. Polite & J. Davis (Eds.), *A continuing challenge in times like these: African American males in school and society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gordon, Edmund W. 1995. "Toward an Equitable System of Educational Assessment." *Journal of Negro Education*, 64(3), 360-372.

Hartman, Chester, ed. 1997. *Double Exposure: Poverty and Race in America*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc. (see especially, Part I, "Is Racism Permanent?")

Robert B. Hill. 1997. *The Strengths of African American Families: Twenty-Five Years Later*, Washington, D. C.: R & B Publishers, pp. 74-94.

Hill Robert B. 1990. "Economic Forces, Structural Discrimination and Black Family Instability" in Harold E. Cheatham, and James B. Stewart (Eds.) . *Black Families: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Publishers, pp. 87-105.

Jordan, Will J. and Julia Lara, and James McPartland. 1996. "Exploring the Causes of Early Dropout Among Race-Ethnic and Gender Groups." *Youth and Society*, 28(1), 62-94.

Lacelle-Peterson, Mark W. and Charlene Rivera. 1994. "Is it Real for All Kids? A Framework for Equitable Assessment Policies for English Language Learners." *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(1), pp. 55-75.

Lopez, Ian F. Hanley. 19995. "The Social Construction of Race." in *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*. Richard Delgado, Editor. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lucas, Tamara and Rosemary Henze, and Ruben Donato. 1990. "Promoting the Success of Latino Language-Minority Students: An Exploratory Study of Six High Schools." *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 315-340.

Nakanishi, Don T. "Asian Pacific Americans and Colleges and Universities." in *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (Eds.), Macmillan Publishing, 683-695.

Rivera, Charlene and Lacelle-Peterson, Mark W. 1993. "Will the National Education Goals improve the Progress of English Language Learners? ERIC Digest. EDO-FL-94-02.

Rivera, Charlene and Lacelle-Peterson, Mark W. 1994. "Is it Real for All Kids? A Framework for Equitable Assessment Policies for English Language Learners." *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(1), 55-75.

Rivera, Charlene and Vincent, C. (In press.). "High School graduation Testing: Policies and Practices in the assessment of English language learners." In *Educational Assessment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Secada, Walter, and Rudolfo Chavez-Chavez, Eugene Garcia, Cipriano Munoz, Jeannie Oakes, Isaura Santiago-Santiago, and Robert Slavin. "No More Excuses: The Final Report of The Hispanic Dropout Project" February, 1988.

Stanfield, J. H. II. 1995. "The myth of race and the human sciences." *Journal of Negro Education*, 64(3), 218-231.

Stewart, James B. "Toward Broader Involvement of Black Economists in Discussions of Race and Public Policy: A Plea for a Reconceptualization of Race and Power in Economic Theory." In *African Americans and Post-Industrial Labor Markets*, J. Stewart, ed., New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997, pp. 15-38.

Swanson, Dena Phillips and Margaret Beale Spencer. 1997. "Developmental Considerations of Gender-Linked Attributes During Adolescence." In R.D. Taylor & M.C. Wang (Eds.), *Social and emotional adjustment and family relations in ethnic minority families* (pp. 181-199) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tucker, William H. 1994. "Introduction: To Make Nature an Accomplice." In *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*, University of Illinois Press, pp. 1-8.

Tucker, William H. 1994. "Conclusion: Science and Safeguards." In *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*, University of Illinois Press, pp. 265-295.

Updegraff, K. A, McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (1996). "Gender roles in marriage: What do they mean for girls' and boys' school achievement?" *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 25(1), 73-88.

Wolf, Richard M. 1996. "The Measurement of Environments: A Follow-Up Study." *Journal of Negro Education*, 64(3), 354-359.

Appendix A. About The Workshop

A WORD FROM THE BOARD

The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board has been given the charge by the Congress to work collaboratively with the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to forge a national consensus with respect to a long-term agenda for educational research, development, dissemination, and the activities of the Office. This research agenda will be made explicit in a biennial Research Priorities Plan, which will set forth specific objectives to be achieved by means of the Federal investment in that Plan.

The Board hopes that today's Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement will produce new knowledge and understanding of the factors that promote or inhibit learning in the diverse populations in American schools. Our objectives in sponsoring this workshop will be significantly advanced by the following outcomes:

1. Recommendations for how race, gender, and class should be conceptualized in educational research;

2. Recommendations for which educational research questions should receive priority and what an overall research agenda should look like;

3. Recommendations for what theoretical and methodological criteria should guide educational research;

4. Recommendations for how educational research can appropriately incorporate analyses that examine the isolated and interactive effects of race, gender, and class.

This conference is sponsored by the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board

A Word from the Facilitator

Welcome to what should be a most interesting and productive time together. The major goal of this workshop sponsored by the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board of the U.S. Department of Education is to recommend to the Board a new generation of educational research addressing the racial, gender, and class impacts on student achievement and underachievement. The panel of experts will not only review pertinent literature but also critique studies with the goal of offering recommendations to fill gaps and to remedy conceptual and methodological shortcomings in three areas: definitional problems of the three basic concepts: race, gender, and class and their use in educational research; the isolated impacts of race, class, and gender in educational achievement/underachievement; and the interactional impacts of the three status variables in this most complex issue in educational research. The team of experts has prepared bibliographies and samples of publications which reflect the agenda. Many of these sources will be included in a master bibliography to be attached to the report of this workshop.

This workshop will acknowledge what we know about the race, gender, and class status impacts on educational achievement and underachievement. We will examine the conventional wisdom, assumptions, and folklore which have impeded us from developing research agendas which provide adequate empirical evidence about what is happening in the schools our children attend.

As we move through the day, please keep in mind that we are all aware of the complexities of the issues we are addressing. Some topics may generate disagreement, and this is to be expected. We admit that due to time constraints we will not exhaust these topics, but we should make a concerted effort to listen to each other and to attain a level of consensus for formulating recommendations. I thank you all for coming.

Your facilitator,

John H. Stanfield, II

Appendix B. The Workshop Agenda

Workshop on Race, Gender, Class, and Student Achievement:
Creating a New Research Agenda on the Race, Gender, and Class Impacts on Educational Achievement and Underachievement

Sponsored by the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board

Washington, DC
Friday, March 6, 1998

Agenda

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Conference Registration
8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Welcome and Informal Introductions Dr. John Stanfield (Facilitator), University of California at Davis
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Panel on Basic Definition of Race Dr. Frank Bonilla, CUNY
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	Break
10:15 a.m. - 11:15 a.m.	Panel on Basic Definition of Class Dr. Edmund T. Gordon, University of Texas at Austin
11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.	Panel on Basic Definition of Gender Dr. Vivian Gadsden, National Center on Fathers and Families
12:15 p.m. - 1:15 p.m.	Working Lunch, Summary of Morning Discussion Dr. Evelyn Hu DeHart, University of Colorado at Boulder
1:15 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	Panel on Isolated Factors - Class, Race, and Gender Dr. William Trent, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
2:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	Break
2:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.	Panel on Interactional Factors - Class, Race, and Gender Scott Miller, The College Board
4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Summary of Afternoon Discussion Dr. Charlene Rivera, George Washington University

Appendix C. **The Workshop Panelists and Workshop Participants**

FACILITATOR:

John H. Stanfield, II, Ph.D., from the Sociology Department at Northwestern University, is a UC Davis professor of sociology, African studies, human development, and community development. Dr. Stanfield is the founding director of the Center for Urban Research and Policy Studies. He has formerly served as assistant to associate professor of sociology and African American studies at Yale University, Eminent Scholar of State Council of Higher Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Cummings Professor of Sociology and American Studies at the College of William and Mary. Distinguished positions and honors include former National Academy of Education Minority Mentee Fellow, former Rockefeller Minority Fellow, former member of the Eastern Sociological Society Board of Directors, National Science Foundation's Model of Excellence Research Award, former Social Science Research Council Fellow in Post-doctoral Foreign Policy Studies, Fulbright Scholar to Sierra Leone (nominated to South Africa), and former editor of Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations. Dr. Stanfield was the senior editor and contributor to *1995 Yearbook of the Journal of Negro Education: Myths and Realities: African Americans and the Measurement of Human Abilities*.

PANELISTS:

Frank Bonilla is the Thomas Hunter Professor of Sociology Emeritus at Hunter College of the City University of New York. He has served as director of CUNY's Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos and professor in CUNY's Ph.D. programs in sociology and political science; executive director of the Inter-University Program for Latino Research (IUPLR), for which he continues to serve on its national advisory board; professor of political science at Stanford University and a senior associate of its Institute of Political Studies; and professor in the political science department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Bonilla has carried out extended research in Latin America (Chile, Brazil, and Venezuela). His current research, writing, and advocacy efforts are focused on promoting Latino academic and policy research capabilities and bringing Latino voices and perspectives into the U.S. foreign policy arena.

Evelyn Hu DeHart, Ph.D., is professor of history and director of the Center for Studies of Ethnicity and Race in America at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She has taught at the City University of New York system, New York University, Washington University in St. Louis, University of Arizona, and University of Michigan, as well as lectured at countless universities and educational and cultural institutions in over seven countries. Dr. Hu DeHart is the recipient of two Fulbrights, to Brazil and Peru, and of a three-year Kellogg National Leadership Award. She has published three books on the Yaqui Indians of northern Mexico and Arizona and numerous scholarly articles on her current research on the Asian diaspora in Latin America and the Caribbean, and written on the politics of multiculturalism. Dr. Hu DeHart founded the Asian/Pacific American Women's Leadership Institute.

Vivian L. Gadsden, Ph.D., is director of the National Center on Fathers and Families (NCOFF) and associate professor in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Gadsden has also served as associate director of the National Center on Adult Literacy at the University of Pennsylvania. Current research projects are: 1) a multi-generational study of 25 African American families, 2) a parent-child Head Start project with African American and Puerto Rican families, 3) a

project with adolescent and young adult mothers and fathers, and 4) a project on cooperative parenting. Dr. Gadsden has published more than thirty journal articles and book chapters on issues related to families, learning, race, and culture. She is currently completing a co-edited third volume from her multi-generational study. Dr. Gadsden serves on several review boards and professional committees in organizations such as the Society for Research in Child Development and the American Education Research Association.

Antoine M. Garibaldi, Ph.D., is Howard University's first provost and chief academic officer and professor of education in the School of Education's Department of Psycho educational Studies and Human Development. He has served in three administrative positions at Xavier University of Louisiana--vice president for academic affairs, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and chairman of the Department of Education. Dr. Garibaldi is the author of ten books and monographs and more than 60 research articles and chapters in scholarly journals and books. His book, *Black Colleges and Universities: Challenges for the Future*, was recognized as one of the outstanding books of 1984 by the American Educational Studies Association. He is a recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's African American Critical Issues Network for his research on elementary and secondary schools. Dr. Garibaldi serves on numerous national professional boards of directors.

Edmund T. Gordon is currently associate professor of anthropology at the University of Texas at Austin and coordinator of the Diaspora□s Program in anthropology. His major interests are culture and power, race, class and gender, identity politics in the African Diaspora in the Americas. His most recent publications include: *The Cultural Politics of Black Masculinity in Transforming Anthropology* and *Disparate Diaspora: Politics and Identity in an African Nicaraguan Community* forthcoming in June, University of Texas Press.

Robert B. Hill, Ph.D., is currently director of the Institute for Urban Research at Morgan State University. He has previously served as research consultant, senior research associate at the Bureau of Social Science Research, and director of research for the National Urban League. He has taught on the adjunct faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, University of Maryland, Howard University, Morgan State University, Princeton University, New York University, and Fordham University. Dr. Hill has served on several high-level panels for the federal government. He is currently a member of the Association of Black Sociologists, the American Sociological Association, the National Economic Association and the Board of Directors of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. Dr. Hill has more than 13 publications on African American and minority sociology.

L. Scott Miller is the director of the National Task Force on Minority High Achievement, a three-year initiative of the College Board designed to respond to the continuing substantial underrepresentation of African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Americans among top students at all levels of the educational system. The Task Force, which was organized in early 1997, has 34 members, including a number of nationally respected educators as well as leaders from other sectors of society. Planning for the Task Force was undertaken by Mr. Miller in 1995 and 1996, with funding from the Exxon Education Foundation and the George Gund Foundation. Several foundations, including Exxon, Gund, and Joyce Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation are supporting the work of the Task Force.

Before joining the College Board, Mr. Miller was a consultant in education and Philanthropy. From 1990-94, he was a senior vice president of the Council for Aid to Education, an organization that provides information to corporations and educational institutions on educational issues and private giving to education.

Jessica Gordon Nembhard, Ph.D., is senior economist at the Institute for Urban Research at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland. She was previously the economic development analyst and acting deputy director for the Black Community Crusade for Children at the Children's Defense Fund. Dr. Nembhard is the author of *Capital Control, Financial Regulation, and Industrial Policy in South Korea and Brazil* and *The Nation We Are Making: A Junior History of Belize*. She is also co-editor of *Creating a New World Economy: Forces of Change and Plans for Action*. Dr. Nembhard has been a co-teacher for the Center for Popular Economics Summer International Institute, and is one of the authors of that Institute's first curriculum. She is a member of the board of directors of the National Economic Association (NEA), and coordinator-treasurer of the District of Columbia Economic Club (a chapter of the NEA).

Charlene Rivera, Ph.D., is director of The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education. She oversees several projects, including the Region III Comprehensive Center, which assists states, districts, and schools to improve teaching and learning practices. She also served as director of the Evaluation Assistance Center East, under which she spearheaded *Promoting Excellence*, a project geared to help limited English proficient students reach high academic standards. Dr. Rivera has served as a bilingual teacher, a Spencer Fellow at the National Academy of Education, and a visiting scholar at the Educational Testing Service. She has served on the editorial board of *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* and has published extensively on the issues of second language proficiency and assessment. She currently serves as principal investigator for the Trading Partners Project, a study of promising practices among migrant education programs that promote continuity of services delivered to migrant children.

William T. Trent, Ph.D., is professor of educational policy studies and sociology at the University of Illinois-Urbana, where he also holds an appointment as associate chancellor. While working as a research assistant at the Social Research Group at The George Washington University, he worked on the 1968 Civil Rights Survey. Dr. Trent was the founding director of Educational Opportunity Program at The George Washington University. He is the recipient of an American Sociological Association minority fellowship, which he used to complete his doctoral studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Dr. Trent has held research positions at the Police Foundation, the Center for Educational Policy, Institute of Policy Affairs, Duke University, and the Center for the Social Organization of Schools at The Johns Hopkins University. Recently, Dr. Trent has turned to questions of race and ethnicity in the preparation of teachers and broader questions of pre- and in-service preparation of teachers.